IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL
AT NAINITAL

Contempt Petition No. 260 of 2004

1. Bhagat Singh S/o of Fate Singh
   R/o Village – Dogarhi
   Post Office – Tangsa
   District – Chamoli
2. Kan Singh S/o Bachan Singh
   R/o Village – Khainuri
   Post Office – Bhimtala
   District – Chamoli
3. Surender Singh S/o Shri Dharm Singh
   R/o Village – Sinder Vani
   Post Office – Shanti Sadan
   District – Chamoli
4. Govind Singh S/o Doma Singh
   R/o Village – Talla Negwarh
   Post Office – Gopeshwar
   District – Chamoli
5. Narender Singh
   S/o Chandra Singh
   R/o Village – Paduli
   Post Office – Gopeshwar
   District – Chamoli
6. Sabar Singh
   S/o Late Jagat Singh
   R/o Village – Sem Dungra
   Post Oficer – Palethi
   District – Chamoli ... Petitioners

Versus

1. Shri Kripal Singh
   Chief Engineer Level – 1
   Public Works Department, Garhwal Circle
   District – Chamoli
2. I.S. Jangpangi
   Prantiya Khand
   Public Works Department, Gopeshwar
   District – Chamoli ... Respondents

Shri Pankaj Purhohit, learned counsel for the petitioners.
Shri R.C. Arya, learned Standing Counsel for the State.

Hon'ble J.C.S. Rawat, J.

1. The present contempt petition has been filed with a prayer that the contemnors had not complied with the order passed by this court on 22.06.2004 in writ petition No. 247 (S/S) of 2003 Bhagat Singh & others Vs. State of Uttaranchal. This court has directed vide order dated

22.06.2004 that *the operation of the order dated 20.03.2003 passed by respondent No. 3 shall remain stayed. The petitioners shall be permitted to work and shall be paid minimum of pay scale of Beldars. Application was disposed of accordingly.* The petitioner filed an application that the order dated 22.06.2004 has not bee complied with by the contemnors.

2. Pursuant to the said application notices were sent to the respondents/contemnors to file their response. The contemnors had alleged in his counter affidavit at para No. 3 that the said order was received by the office on 01.07.2004 and the petitioners were allowed accordingly to work immediately from 6.11.2004 as Beldars on daily wages. The letter had already been sent to the petitioners on 06.11.2004.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners had also stated that the petitioners had been allowed to work w.e.f. 06.11.04.

4. In view of the above facts and circumstances of the case, the order has been complied with.

5. The contempt petition is disposed of accordingly.

6. The notices issued against the respondents stand discharged.

(J.C.S. RAWAT, J.)

28th October, 2005
Shiv